

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant appreciates the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Non-Final Office Action of November 17, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Hsu for the kind and courteous interview of February 18, 2010. In the interview, features of independent claims 1, 41, and 48 were discussed in light of Levy. It was agreed that the claims as currently pending are distinguishable over Levy and the art of record. In addition, it was agreed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph would be withdrawn. Examiner Hsu indicated that an additional search on the pending claims would be made.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 41, and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 41, and 48 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. For example and by way of illustration only, the Examiner is directed towards paragraph [0060] and FIG. 8 disclosing, in part,

[t]he PCI Express switch 880 converts the sixteen lanes 871 coming from the chipset 220 root complex into two or more distributed x16 links 872, each connected to a x16 PCI Express Graphics slot. When connected by the switch 880 to the chipset 220, a video card 870 may send a very large burst of data via the PCI Express connection 871 and the distributed x16 link 872. Because the video card 870 does not continuously export data at the capacity of the PCI Express connection 871, the use of the switch 880

better allows the Multi-Video Card PCI Express
Motherboard 800 to exploit the large capacity of the
x16 connection to the chipset 220.

As shown from the foregoing, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize express support for a switch configured to distribute lanes dynamically during operation including data transmission as claimed. In addition, the Office has acquiesced to removing the rejection in the interview. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-7, 29, 30, 32-34, 41, 44-48, and 50-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0088469 A1 issued to Levy, U.S. Patent No. 6,295,566 issued to Stufflebeam and U.S. Patent No. 5,546,530 issued to Grimaud, *et al.* (“Grimaud”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

During the interview it was agreed that Levy fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 41, and 48. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that Levy fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “wherein said switch is configured to distribute lanes dynamically during operation including data transmission to said plurality of high-speed video card slots responsive to changes in bandwidth needs during processing by said video cards” as recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, Levy fails to teach or suggest a switch “configured to distribute lanes dynamically during operation including data transmission” and therefore does not disclose all the features of claim 1. Similar arguments exist for independent claims 41 and 48.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 1 is also allowable as it recites, *inter alia*,

a switch connected to said interconnect and adapted to convert the interconnect lanes into a plurality of distributed links such that there is a different one of said distributed links providing a connection to each of said plurality of high-speed video card slots.

Levy fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 for reasons of record. *See* March 9, 2009 Response and Amendment, arguments of which are hereby incorporated by reference. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Independent claims 41 and 48 are allowable for similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the claims for examination on the merits. Examiner Joni Hsu is cordially invited to contact the undersigned should she have any questions about the above remarks. Timely allowance of the pending claims is requested.

In the event that an appropriate fee amount is not enclosed by check for any fees due in connection with the filing of this Response or requisite extensions of time, please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1349.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/3/10

By: 

Scott J. Hawranek
Registration No. 52,411

Paul A. Roberts
Registration No. 56,990

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
555 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-637-5600
Facsimile: 202-637-5910
email: dcptopatent@hhlaw.com
Customer No.: 24633